



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,564	03/27/2006	Tetsuya Kuhara	TOYA108.014APC	7010
29995 7590 04/28/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER LANDSMAN, ROBERT S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1647				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/28/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/573,564

Applicant(s)

KUHARA ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT LANDSMAN

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,5,7,9,11,18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,7,9,11,18 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Formal Matters

- A. The Amendment filed 3/18/08 has been entered into the record.
- B. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 18 and 20 are pending. Claims 2 and 3 are the subject of this Office Action.
- C. The Examiner thanks Applicants for pointing out co-pending applications

2. Rejoinder

- A. Since the elected product claims are not in condition for allowance, the method claims which depend from these claims will not be rejoined at this time.

3. Claim Objections

- A. The syntax of claim 2 can be improved. The claim is a product claim. However, the claim also recites what amounts to method steps in that it states that the agent comprises divided doses for 7 days and that the second dose is administered 5 days after...

4. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph – scope of enablement

- A. The rejection of claims 2-4 has been overcome in view of Applicants' amendment to limit the Toll-like receptor ligand to poly I:C and to a non-human animal.

5. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph – new matter

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- A. Claims 2 and 3 (as well as withdrawn, but amended method claims) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s)

Art Unit: 1647

contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 2 recites "5 days after the beginning of administration of the first agent." Original claims only recite(d) "5 days before completion." This is a new matter rejection. Claim 3 is rejected since it depends from claim 2.

6. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

A. Claims 2 and 3 remain rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schmidt and further in view of Decicco for the reasons already of record on pages 3-4 of the Office Action mailed 12/31/07.

Applicants argue that the claims have been amended to recite the specific dosing schedule. This argument has been considered, but is not deemed persuasive. As discussed under "Claim Objections" above, the claims are product claims. While a dosing schedule is included in the claims, the fact remains that this receives no patentable weight. The claims are drawn to a drug combination comprising lactoferrin and poly I:C. The dosing schedule simply teaches how the product intends to be used. The art still makes obvious the combination regardless of when to administer each drug. Even, *arguendo*, the limitation of "7 days" was given patentable weight, Wang teach administering lactoferrin for 9 days, which would include the 7 days of the instant claims. Regardless, [W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 454, 105 USPQ 223,235, (CCPA 1955).

The argument that unexpectedly high levels of NK cells were seen when lactoferrin was administered in 7 divided doses is also unpersuasive. First, it cannot be determined from Table 1 of the specification that lactoferrin was administered in 7 divided doses. Even, *arguendo*, 7 doses were used, an unexpectedly high NK cell number was only seen when polyIC was administered 3 days before completion of administration (of, it is believed, lactoferrin). However, the claims are not limited to this time period/dosing schedule. The claims recite "5 days after the beginning of administration of the first

Art Unit: 1647

agent.” It appears, therefore, that 5 days after beginning lactoferrin administration would be 2 days before completing lactoferrin administration.

If Applicants can explain how the entire drug combination can be read as a product, or, preferably, rewrite the claim to reflect such, the rejection will be reconsidered. This is not a guarantee that the rejection will be withdrawn.

7. Conclusion

A. No claim is allowable.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Landsman, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0888. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10 AM – 6:30 PM (eastern).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Robert Landsman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647